

## REMARKS

Claims 1-25 were previously cancelled. In the present response, claims 26 and 32 are amended and new claims 38-40 are added. Therefore, claims 26-40 are currently presented.

In the Office Action mailed April 26, 2004, the Examiner proposed a change to the language of claim 26. Accordingly, claim 26 has been amended in a manner suggested by the Examiner merely for clarity purposes. Claim 32 has also been amended in a similar fashion merely for the same purpose.

Claims 26-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,592,375 to Bardwell C. Salmon et al. (hereinafter referred to as the "Salmon reference"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 26 has been amended in a manner to recite that the "aggregated first data describing the plurality of suppliers comprises...quantitative indicators of supplier qualities including at least one of quantity of patents held, magnitude or quantity of grants received, and magnitude or quantity of contracts awarded...." These quantitative indicators of supplier qualities are simply not taught, disclosed, or suggested by the Salmon reference. Claim 26 has further been amended to recite that the "aggregated second data describing the project comprises...quantitative indicators of particular supplier qualities including at least one of desire minimum quantity of patents held, particular minimum magnitude or quantity of grants received, and particular minimum magnitude or quantity of contracts awarded...." These quantitative indicators of particular supplier qualities are also not taught, disclosed, or suggested by the Salmon reference. Each of these quantitative indicators recited in amended claim 21 is simply not a factor or category of information contemplated in the system in the Salmon reference. As a result, claim 26 as amended is believed to be patentably distinguishable over the Salmon reference.

Claims 27-31 depend from amended claim 26 and, at least by virtue of their dependency, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 32 has been amended in a similar manner as claim 26 and, therefore, is believed to be allowable over the Salmon reference for at least for the reasons set forth for amended claim 26. Claims 33-37 depend from amended claim 32 and, at least by virtue of their dependency, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

A *prima facie* case for rejection has not been made at least because the Salmon reference does not include every element claimed.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

New claims 38-40 depend from amended claim 26 and, therefore, are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

If for any reason an insufficient fee has been paid, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge the insufficiency to Deposit Account No. 19-3878.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (602) 528-4100.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 25, 2004

William R. Bachand  
William R. Bachand  
Reg. No. 34,980

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.  
Two Renaissance Square  
40 North Central Avenue, Suite 2700  
Phoenix, AZ 85004-4498  
Telephone (602) 528-4100